

THE BIFURCATION SET OF A REAL POLYNOMIAL FUNCTION OF TWO VARIABLES AND NEWTON POLYGONS OF SINGULARITIES AT INFINITY

MASAHARU ISHIKAWA[†], TAT-THANG NGUYEN[‡], AND TIẾN-SƠN PHẠM^{*}

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we determine the bifurcation set of a real polynomial function of two variables for non-degenerate case in the sense of Newton polygons by using a toric compactification. We also count the number of singular phenomena at infinity, called “cleaving” and “vanishing” in the same setting. Finally, we give an upper bound of the number of elements in the bifurcation set in terms of its Newton polygon. To obtain the upper bound, we apply toric modifications to the singularities at infinity successively.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $f : K^2 \rightarrow K$ be a polynomial function, where K is either $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{R}$. It is well-known that there exists a finite set $B \subset K$ such that $f : K^2 \setminus f^{-1}(B) \rightarrow K \setminus B$ is a locally trivial fibration. The smallest set of B with the above properties is called the *bifurcation set*, which we denote by B_f . Let Σ_f denote the set of critical values of f . Obviously, $\Sigma_f \subset B_f$. An element in B_f caused by such a singular phenomenon at infinity is called an *atypical value* of f at infinity.

There are many studies aiming to determine the bifurcation sets of polynomial functions. The results of Suzuki [15], Ha and Le [5] and Ha and Nguyen [6] are known to be pioneering works in these studies, where geometrical and topological characterizations of atypical values at infinity of complex polynomial maps are given. The Newton polygon is one of the main tools in the study of atypical values at infinity, for instance see [11, 10, 17, 8, 14]. Concerning real polynomial functions of two variables, Tibăr and Zaharia gave a characterization of the bifurcation set in [16] in terms of the first betti number, the Euler characteristic and vanishing and splitting phenomena of atypical fibers over the bifurcation set. Real polynomial functions of

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 32S20, Secondary: 32S15, 32S30.

Key words and phrases. atypical value, bifurcation set, toric compactification.

[†]The first author is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K05140.

[‡]The second author is supported by the National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED), Vietnam.

^{*}The third author is supported by the National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED), Grant number 101.04-2016.05, Vietnam.

two variables were studied by Coste and de la Puente more precisely in [3], where they gave a characterization of bifurcation sets by using “clusters” and gave an algorithm to determine them. See [2, 7, 4] for further studies related to this topic.

In this paper, we study the bifurcation sets of real polynomial functions of two variables using Newton polygons, associated toric compactifications and successive toric modifications. These techniques were used by the first author in [8] for determining the bifurcation sets of complex polynomial functions algorithmically.

To state our results, we prepare some terminologies. Set $f(x, y) = \sum_{(m,n)} a_{m,n} x^m y^n$, where $m, n \geq 0$. Let $\Delta(f)$ be the convex hull of the integral points $(m, n) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $a_{m,n} \neq 0$. Note that we do not include the origin $(0, 0)$ in the definition of $\Delta(f)$ when $f(0, 0) = 0$, compare with [9]. A vector $P = {}^t(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$ consisting of coprime integers p and q is called a *primitive covector*. For a given P , let $d(P; f)$ denote the minimal value of the linear function $pX + qY$ for $(X, Y) \in \Delta(f)$. Set $\Delta(P; f) := \{(X, Y) \in \Delta(f) \mid pX + qY = d(P; f)\}$, which is called a *face* of $\Delta(f)$ if $\dim \Delta(P; f) = 1$. The partial sum $f_P(x, y) := \sum_{(m,n) \in \Delta(P; f)} a_{m,n} x^m y^n$ is called the *boundary function* for the covector P . If $\Delta(P; f)$ is a face then it is called the *face function*. Let $\Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ (resp. $\Gamma_\infty^0(f)$, $\Gamma_\infty^-(f)$) denote the set of faces $\Delta(P; f)$ of f such that $P = {}^t(p, q)$ satisfies either $p < 0$ or $q < 0$ and satisfies $d(P; f) > 0$ (resp. $d(P; f) = 0$, $d(P; f) < 0$). For a set $\Gamma(f)$ of faces of $\Delta(f)$, we say that f is *non-degenerate* on $\Gamma(f)$ if the system of equations $\frac{\partial f_P}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f_P}{\partial y} = 0$ has no solutions in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$ for any face $\Delta(P; f)$ in $\Gamma(f)$.

A face $\Delta(P; f)$ in $\Gamma_\infty^0(f)$ is called a *bad face*. The face function on a bad face is given as

$$f_P(x, y) = b_P(t(x, y)), \quad t(x, y) = x^{|q|} y^{|p|}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $P = {}^t(p, q)$ and b_P is a polynomial of one variable t . We say that f_P is *Morse* if $b_P(t)$ is a Morse function on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ (i.e., it has only non-degenerate critical points on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$).

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $f(x, y)$ is non-degenerate on $\Gamma_\infty^+(f) \cup \Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ and the face function on any bad face is Morse. Then, $c \in B_f$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (i) $c \in \Sigma_f$;
- (ii) $c = f(0, 0)$ and there exists $\Delta(P; \tilde{f}) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(\tilde{f})$ such that $\tilde{f}_P(x, y) = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$, where $\tilde{f}(x, y) = f(x, y) - f(0, 0)$;
- (iii) c is a critical value of $b_P|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}}$ in (1.1) for a bad face $\Delta(P; f)$.

Remark that the conditions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied for generic choice of coefficients of f .

It is known in [16, 3] that the value $c \in B_f$ is characterized by the existence of a cleaving or vanishing family whose limit is $f = c$. The precise definitions of these families are given in Section 2.

In the next theorem, we determine the number of cleaving and vanishing families. For each $\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$, let $r^+(P; f)$ denote the number of non-zero real roots of $g_i(v_i) = 0$ in (2.1) below. For each bad face $\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^0(f)$, let $r^0(P; f)$ denote the number of non-zero real roots of $\frac{db_P}{dt}(t) = 0$. Let $\text{cleav}(f)$ and $\text{vanish}(f)$ denote the numbers of cleaving families and vanishing families of f , respectively.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $f(x, y)$ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1.1. Suppose further that f has only isolated singularities. Then*

$$\text{cleav}(f) + \text{vanish}(f) = 2(R^+ + R^0) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \text{vanish}(f) \leq 2R^0,$$

where

$$R^+ = \sum_{\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)} r^+(P; f), \quad R^0 = \sum_{\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^0(f)} r^0(P; f).$$

In particular, if there is no bad face then there is no vanishing family.

Note that $r^+(P; f) \leq \ell(P; f)$ and $r^0(P; f) \leq \ell(P; \tilde{f})$, where $\ell(P; f)$ is the number of lattice points on $\Delta(P; f)$ minus 1 and $\tilde{f}(x, y) = f(x, y) - f(0, 0)$.

Even if f does not satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, by applying toric modifications successively, we can obtain an upper bound of the number of elements in B_f . For each face $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^-(f)$, set $\mu(R_i; f) = \sum_{j=1}^\eta (\mu_j - 1)$, where $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\eta$ are the multiplicities of the non-zero real roots $s_1, \dots, s_\eta$ of $g_i(v_i) = 0$ in (2.1) below. Note that $\mu(R_i; f) \leq \ell(R_i; f)$. Let R^+ and R^0 be the integers defined in Theorem 1.2. Let $|B_f|$ and $|\Sigma_f|$ denote the numbers of elements in B_f and Σ_f , respectively.

Theorem 1.3. *The following inequality holds:*

$$|B_f| \leq |\Sigma_f| + \epsilon + R^0 + \sum_{\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^-(f)} \mu(P; f),$$

where $\epsilon = 0$ if $R^+ = 0$ and $\epsilon = 1$ if $R^+ > 0$.

A similar result for complex polynomial functions had been obtained in [10], see also [8, Corollary 6.6].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the definition of an admissible toric compactification with respect to primitive covectors, and give the definitions of cleaving and vanishing families and their equivalence relations. In the subsequent three sections, we give the proofs of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. Two examples are given in the end of Section 3. The definition of an admissible toric modification is given in the beginning of Section 5, before giving the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Toric compactification. We first recall some definitions given in [9] which will be used in this work. Set $f(x, y) = \sum_{(m,n)} a_{m,n} x^m y^n$, where $m, n \geq 0$. A boundary function $f_P(x, y)$ is said to be *non-degenerate* if the system of equations $\frac{\partial f_P}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f_P}{\partial y} = 0$ has no solutions in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. Otherwise it is said to be *degenerate*. The polynomial f is called *convenient* if $\Delta(f)$ intersects both positive axes.

Let $\Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ (resp. $\Gamma_\infty^0(f)$, $\Gamma_\infty^-(f)$) denote the set of faces $\Delta(P; f)$ of f such that $P = {}^t(p, q)$ satisfies either $p < 0$ or $q < 0$ and satisfies $d(P; f) > 0$ (resp. $d(P; f) = 0$, $d(P; f) < 0$). For a set $\Gamma(f)$ of faces of $\Delta(f)$, we say that f is *non-degenerate* on $\Gamma(f)$ if f_P is non-degenerate for any face $\Delta(P; f)$ in $\Gamma(f)$. Note that the non-degeneracy condition in [9] corresponds to the non-degeneracy on $\Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ in this paper.

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial function. We give the definition of an admissible toric compactification with respect to the Newton polygon $\Delta(f)$. Let $Q_i = {}^t(p_i, q_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, be primitive covectors which satisfy the following:

- (1) either p_i or q_i is negative;
- (2) $\Delta(Q_i; f)$ is a face of $\Delta(f)$; and
- (3) the indices are assigned in the counter-clockwise orientation.

Let $R_i = {}^t(r_i, s_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, be primitive covectors which satisfy the following:

- (1) $R_1 = {}^t(1, 0)$, $R_2 = {}^t(0, 1)$;
- (2) either r_i or s_i is negative for each R_i , $i = 3, \dots, m$;
- (3) $\{Q_i\}$ is contained in $\{R_3, \dots, R_m\}$;
- (4) the indices are assigned in the counter-clockwise orientation; and
- (5) the determinants of the matrices (R_i, R_{i+1}) , $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, and (R_m, R_1) are 1.

For convenience, we set $R_{m+1} = R_1$. For each $\text{Cone}(R_i, R_{i+1})$, $i = 2, \dots, m$, an affine coordinate chart $(u_i, v_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is defined by the coordinate transformation

$$x = u_i^{r_i} v_i^{r_{i+1}}, \quad y = u_i^{s_i} v_i^{s_{i+1}}.$$

Then a smooth toric variety X is obtained by gluing these coordinate charts, which is described as

$$X = (\mathbb{R}^*)^2 \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m E(R_i) \right) = \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=3}^m E(R_i) \right),$$

where $E(R_i)$ is the exceptional divisor corresponding to the covector R_i . The real variety X is called the *admissible toric compactification* of $\mathbb{R}^2$ associated with $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$.

Let U_i denote the local chart with coordinates (u_i, v_i) corresponding to $\text{Cone}(R_i, R_{i+1})$ for $i = 2, \dots, m$. On U_i , the function f has the form

$$f(u_i, v_i) = u_i^{d(R_i; f)} v_i^{d(R_{i+1}; f)} (g_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i)), \quad (2.1)$$

where g_i is a polynomial of one variable v_i and h_i is a polynomial of two variables (u_i, v_i) . The divisor $E(R_i)$ in this chart is given by $u_i = 0$.

For an algebraic curve C in $\mathbb{R}^2$, its closure in X is called the *strict transform* of C . Set $f(x, y) = x^\alpha y^\beta F(x, y)$, where α (resp. β) is a non-negative integer such that x (resp. y) does not divide F . Let V_f , V_F , V_1 and V_2 denote the strict transforms of $f(x, y) = 0$, $F(x, y) = 0$, $x = 0$ and $y = 0$ in X , respectively. In particular, $V_f = V_F \cup V_1 \cup V_2$. Note that V_1 (resp. V_2) is empty if α (resp. β) is 0.

Lemma 2.1. (1) For $i = 3, \dots, m$, V_F does not intersect $E(R_i)$ unless $R_i \in \{Q_1, \dots, Q_n\}$.
 (2) For $i = 3, \dots, m-1$, V_F does not intersect $E(R_i) \cap E(R_{i+1})$.
 (3) If $\alpha \geq 1$ (resp. $\beta \geq 1$) then V_1 (resp. V_2) intersects $E(R_m)$ (resp. $E(R_3)$) transversely.

Proof. All the assertions in this lemma are well-known. For instance, the explanation in [12] restricted to the two variable case works for real polynomial maps also. We only check the assertion (3) to confirm the usage of indices. The curves V_1 and $E(R_m)$ are given on U_m as $\{(u_m, v_m) \in U_m \mid v_m = 0\}$ and $\{(u_m, v_m) \in U_m \mid u_m = 0\}$, respectively. Hence they intersect transversely. Similarly, V_2 and $E(R_3)$ are given on U_2 as $\{(u_2, v_2) \in U_2 \mid u_2 = 0\}$ and $\{(u_2, v_2) \in U_2 \mid v_2 = 0\}$, respectively. Hence they intersect transversely. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. Let i be an index in $\{3, \dots, m\}$. Suppose that R_i satisfies one of the following:

- (i) $\Delta(R_i; f)$ is not a bad face and f_{R_i} is non-degenerate.
- (ii) $\Delta(R_i; f)$ is a bad face and $b_{R_i}(t) = 0$ in (1.1) has no non-zero real multiple root.

Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the intersection points of $E(R_i)$ and V_F and the non-zero real roots of $g_i(v_i) = 0$. Moreover, they intersect transversely at these points.

Proof. The divisor $E(R_i)$ is given on U_i as $\{(u_i, v_i) \in U_i \mid u_i = 0\}$. On the other hand, $V_F \cap U_i$ is the set $\{(u_i, v_i) \in U_i \mid g_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i) = 0\}$ with excluding isolated points on $u_i = 0$. Let $(0, s)$ be an intersection point of $u_i = 0$ and $g_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i) = 0$, where $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Since s is a single root of $g_i(v_i) = 0$ in both of cases (i) and (ii), $\frac{\partial(g_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i))}{\partial v_i}(0, s) \neq 0$. Hence $g_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i) = 0$ is smooth at $(0, s)$, i.e. $(0, s)$ is not an isolated point, and V_F intersects $u_i = 0$ transversely at $(0, s)$. $\square$

Remark 2.3. The assumption of non-degeneracy of f_{R_i} is necessary. For example if $g_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i) = (v_i - 1)^2 + u_i^2$ then the intersection point $(0, 1)$ with $u_i = 0$ is isolated.

2.2. Cleaving and vanishing at infinity. Let N be a small, compact tubular neighborhood of $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ in X .

Definition 2.4. A continuous family $\{(\gamma_t, \delta_t, c_t)\}_{t \in (0,1)}$ of triples of a proper arc γ_t in $N \setminus \cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ whose endpoints lie on the boundary ∂N , a closed, connected subset $\delta_t \subset \gamma_t$, which is either a closed arc or a point, and a real number c_t is called a *cleaving family* of f if it satisfies the following:

- (1) $\gamma_t \subset f^{-1}(c_t)$; and
- (2) $c := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} c_t$ satisfies $|c| < \infty$ and $\delta := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta_t \subset \cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$.

If there exists a cleaving family with limit $f = c$, then we say that the curve $f = c$ is *cleaving at infinity*.

Note that the definition of a cleaving family depends on the compactification X of $\mathbb{R}^2$, though the existence of a cleaving family and its value c do not. In this sense, the statement “ $f = c$ is cleaving at infinity” does not depend on the choice of X . This definition coincides with that in [3, p.30] if we state it without compactification. Obviously, if $f = c$ is cleaving at infinity then $c \in B_f$.

Definition 2.5. A continuous family $\{(C_t, c_t)\}_{t \in (0,1)}$ of pairs of a real number c_t and a connected component C_t of $f = c_t$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is called a *vanishing family* if it satisfies the following:

- (1) $C_t \subset N \setminus \cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$; and
- (2) $c := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} c_t$ satisfies $|c| < \infty$ and $C := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} C_t \subset \cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$.

If there exists a vanishing family with limit $f = c$, then we say that the curve $f = c$ is *vanishing at infinity*.

Note that the definition of a vanishing family depends on the compactification X of $\mathbb{R}^2$, though the existence of a vanishing family and its value c do not. In this sense, the statement “ $f = c$ is vanishing at infinity” does not depend on the choice of X . In [16], the value $c \in B_f$ is characterized by the first betti numbers and Euler characteristics of fibers and “vanishing” and “splitting” phenomena. The definition of a vanishing family coincides with the “vanishing” in [16] if we state it without compactification. Obviously, if $f = c$ is vanishing at infinity then $c \in B_f$.

Lemma 2.6 ([16, 3], see p.31 in [3]). *Suppose that $c \in B_f$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $c \in \Sigma_f$;
- (ii) $f = c$ is cleaving at infinity;
- (iii) $f = c$ is vanishing at infinity.

Since the definitions of these families depend on the choice of the compact neighborhoods N , the parameter t and the subsets $\{\delta_t\}_{t \in (0,1)}$, we need to introduce an equivalence relation to remove these ambiguities. The equivalence relation is defined as follows.

Definition 2.7. (1) Two cleaving families $\{(\gamma_t, \delta_t, c_t)\}_{t \in (0,1)}$ and $\{(\gamma'_t, \delta'_t, c'_t)\}_{t' \in (0,1)}$, defined in compact tubular neighborhoods N and N' of $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ respectively, are *equivalent* if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $s \in (0, \varepsilon)$ there exists $s' \in (0, 1)$ such that $c_s = c'_{s'}$ and $\gamma_s \cap \gamma'_{s'} \neq \emptyset$.

(2) Two vanishing families $\{(C_t, c_t)\}_{t \in (0,1)}$ and $\{(C'_t, c'_t)\}_{t' \in (0,1)}$, defined in compact tubular neighborhoods N and N' of $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ respectively, are *equivalent* if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $s \in (0, \varepsilon)$ there exists $s' \in (0, 1)$ such that $c_s = c'_{s'}$ and $C_s = C'_{s'}$.

Later, we will count the numbers of cleaving and vanishing families up to these equivalence relations.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1 AND EXAMPLES

Theorem 1.1 will follow from the next proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that $f(x, y)$ is non-degenerate on $\Gamma_\infty^+(f) \cup \Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ and that $b_P(t) = 0$ in (1.1) has no non-zero real multiple root for any bad face $\Delta(P; f)$. Then, $0 \in B_f$ if and only if either (i) $0 \in \Sigma_f$ or (ii) there exists $\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ such that $f_P(x, y) = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. Moreover, if it is in case (ii) then $f = 0$ is cleaving at infinity.*

We divide the proof into three lemmas. Note that the proofs of the first two lemmas for complex polynomials are written, for example, in [11, 13], which are based on the Curve Selection Lemma at infinity, and their arguments work in real case also. We here give different proofs based on the toric compactification X . Let N denote a small, compact tubular neighborhood of $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ in X .

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that f is convenient and non-degenerate on $\Gamma_\infty^-(f)$. Then $0 \in B_f$ if and only if $0 \in \Sigma_f$.*

Proof. Since $\Sigma_f \subset B_f$, it is enough to show that if $0 \in B_f$ then $0 \in \Sigma_f$. Assume that $0 \notin \Sigma_f$. By Lemma 2.6, it is enough to check that $f = 0$ is not cleaving and not vanishing at infinity. Note that there is no bad face since f is convenient, and V_f intersects $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ transversely by Lemma 2.1 and 2.2.

We first prove that $f = 0$ is not cleaving at infinity. Assume that $f = 0$ is cleaving at infinity. Then V_f must intersect $E(R_i)$ for some $i = 3, \dots, m$. Let p be an intersection point of V_f and $E(R_i)$. Note that $p \in \delta$, where δ is the limit of closed, connected

sets $\{\delta_t\}_{t \in (0,1)}$ in Definition 2.4. Since f is convenient, we have $d(R_i; f) < 0$. Then any nearby fiber of V_f in N near p is a simple arc connecting a point near $V_f \cap \partial N$ and the point p , see Figure 1. Hence the fibration at infinity near p is trivial, which contradicts the assumption that $f = 0$ is cleaving at p .




FIGURE 1. The triviality of the fibration at infinity in the case $d(R_i; f) < 0$. The sign $-$ means that $E(R_i)$ satisfies $d(R_i; f) < 0$. The painted region is the neighborhood N .

Next we check that $f = 0$ is not vanishing at infinity. Since $d(R_i; f) < 0$ for any $i = 3, \dots, m$, if a vanishing family exists then there exists a sequence $\{(t_j, s)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of points on U_i for some $i \in \{3, \dots, m\}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_j = 0$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f|_{U_i}(t_j, s) = 0$ and $g_i(s) \neq 0$. However, from (2.1), we see that $|\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f|_{U_i}(t_j, s)| = \infty$, which is a contradiction. Thus $0 \notin B_f$ by Lemma 2.6. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $f(0,0) \neq 0$ and f is not convenient. Suppose further that f is non-degenerate on $\Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ and $b_P(t) = 0$ in (1.1) has no non-zero real multiple root for any bad face $\Delta(P; f)$. Then $0 \in B_f$ if and only if $0 \in \Sigma_f$.*

Proof. We assume $0 \notin \Sigma_f$ and prove $0 \notin B_f$. By Lemma 2.6, it is enough to check that $f = 0$ is not cleaving and not vanishing at infinity.

First we show that $f = 0$ is not cleaving at infinity. Let R_i be a covector such that $E(R_i)$ intersects V_f , where $i = 3, \dots, m$. If $d(R_i; f) = 0$ then the condition (ii) in Lemma 2.2 holds by the assumption. By Lemma 2.2, all nearby fibers of $f = 0$ near $E(R_i)$ are transverse to $E(R_i)$, see Figure 2. Hence the fibration at the infinity is trivial. The triviality also holds if $d(R_i; f) < 0$ as we had seen in the proof of Lemma 3.2.

Next we check that $f = 0$ is not vanishing at infinity. If there is a vanishing family whose limit intersects $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) = 0$ then, since $f(u_i, v_i)$ in (2.1) has no factor u_i^{-1} , the limit in U_i should be given by $f(u_i, v_i) = 0$, which this is nothing but $V_f \cap U_i$. If $g_i(v_i) = 0$ in (2.1) has a non-zero real solution then, since it is not a multiple root, the limit cannot be contained in $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) = 0$. If $g_i(v_i) = 0$




FIGURE 2. The triviality of the fibration at infinity in the case $d(R_i; f) = 0$. The sign 0 means that $E(R_i)$ satisfies $d(R_i; f) = 0$.

has no non-zero real solution then $V_f \cap E(R_i) \cap U_i = \emptyset$. Hence, in either case, there is no vanishing family. The limit cannot intersect $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) < 0$ by the same reason as we had seen in the proof of Lemma 3.2. This completes the proof. $\square$

Finally, we study the case where either $x|f$ or $y|f$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that f is non-degenerate on $\Gamma_\infty^+(f) \cup \Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ and that $b_P(t) = 0$ in (1.1) has no non-zero real multiple root for any bad face $\Delta(P; f)$. Suppose further that either $x|f$ or $y|f$. Then, $0 \in B_f$ if and only if either (i) $0 \in \Sigma_f$ or (ii) there exists $\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ such that $f_P(x, y) = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. Moreover, if it is in case (ii) then $f = 0$ is cleaving at infinity.*

Proof. Set $f(x, y) = x^\alpha y^\beta F(x, y)$ with either $\alpha > 0$ or $\beta > 0$. For convenience, we choose $R_3, \dots, R_m$ such that $d(R_m; f) > 0$ and f_{R_m} is a monomial if $\alpha > 0$ and that $d(R_3; f) > 0$ and f_{R_3} is a monomial if $\beta > 0$. Since the indices of the covectors $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ are assigned in the counter-clockwise orientation, if $\alpha > 0$ then there exists an index k such that $d(R_k; f) \leq 0$ and $d(R_i; f) > 0$ for $i > k$. Similarly, if $\beta > 0$ then there exists an index k' such that $d(R_i; f) > 0$ for $3 \leq i \leq k'$ and $d(R_{k'+1}; f) \leq 0$. Note that $E(R_k) \cap E(R_{k'}) = \emptyset$ when $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$.

Suppose that there exists $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ with $i \geq k$ such that $f_{R_i}(x, y) = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. Let i_0 be the largest index such that $d(R_{i_0}; f) > 0$ and $f_{R_{i_0}}(x, y)$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. We consider the real toric variety X obtained by the admissible toric compactification of $\mathbb{R}^2$ associated with $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$. Let γ be a branch of V_f in N intersecting $E(R_{i_0})$ and being nearest to $E(R_{i_0+1})$. By Lemma 2.1 (3), $V_1 \cap N$ is a short arc in N intersecting $E(R_m)$ transversely, see Figure 3. Thus we can find a cleaving family between V_1 and γ in N . If there exists $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ with $3 \leq i \leq k'$ such that $f_{R_i}(x, y) = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$ then there exists a cleaving family by the same reason. Thus, in either case, we have $0 \in B_f$.




FIGURE 3. A cleaving family between V_1 and γ . The sign $+$ means that $E(R_i)$ satisfies $d(R_i; f) > 0$.

Now we prove the converse. Suppose that there does not exist $\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ such that $f_P(x, y) = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. By Lemma 2.6, it is enough to check that $f = 0$ is not cleaving and not vanishing at infinity. We first check that $f = 0$ is not cleaving. For any $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$, since $f_{R_i}(x, y) = 0$ has no solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$, V_F does not intersect $E(R_i)$ by Lemma 2.2. If V_F intersects $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) = 0$ then, by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, the fibration at infinity near $E(R_i)$ is trivial, see Figure 2. The triviality also holds in the case where V_F intersects $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) < 0$ as we have seen in the proof of Lemma 3.2, see Figure 1. This shows that there is no cleaving family near the intersection of V_F with $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$.

By Lemma 2.1, it remains to show that there is no cleaving family near the intersection of V_1 with $E(R_m)$ and near the intersection of V_2 with $E(R_3)$. We only check the former case. The latter case is proved similarly. On U_m , f has the form

$$f(u_m, v_m) = u_m^{d(R_m; f)} v_m^{d(R_1; f)} (g_m(v_m) + u_m h_m(u_m, v_m)),$$

where $V_f \cap U_m$ corresponds to the curve $v_m^{d(R_1; f)} (g_m(v_m) + u_m h_m(u_m, v_m)) = 0$. Since the covectors $R_3, \dots, R_m$ are chosen such that f_{R_m} is a monomial, V_f intersects $E(R_m)$ only at $E(R_m) \cap V_1$ by Lemma 2.1. If $\Gamma_\infty^0(f) \neq \emptyset$ then a nearby fiber of f passing near V_1 intersects $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ at a point near $E(R_{k-1}) \cap E(R_k)$ as shown on the left in Figure 4. Therefore, the fibration is trivial at infinity. If $\Gamma_\infty^0(f) = \emptyset$ then nearby fibers intersect $E(R_{k-1}) \cap E(R_k)$ as shown on the right in Figure 4 since $\Delta(R_{k-1}; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ and $\Delta(R_k; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$. Therefore, the fibration is again trivial at infinity. Thus $f = 0$ is not cleaving at infinity.

Next we check that $f = 0$ is not vanishing at infinity. As we explained in the proof of Lemma 3.3, a vanishing family does not exist in a neighborhood of $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) = 0$. It does not exist near $E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) > 0$ also since a nearby fiber cannot stay in N as we had seen in Figure 4. A vanishing family does not exist near




FIGURE 4. The triviality of the fibration at infinity for nearby fibers passing near V_1 .

$E(R_i)$ with $d(R_i; f) < 0$ by the same reason as we had seen in the proof of Lemma 3.2. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The assertion follows from Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. If it is in case (ii), by applying Proposition 3.1 to $\tilde{f}(x, y) = f(x, y) - c$, we have $c \in B_f$.

If it is in case (iii) then $f - c$ has the form

$$f(u_i, v_i) - c = v_i^{d(R_{i+1}; f)}(\tilde{g}_i(v_i) + u_i h_i(u_i, v_i)),$$

where $\tilde{g}_i(v_i) = g_i(v_i) - cv_i^{-d(R_{i+1}; f)}$, and there exists a non-zero real root s of $\tilde{g}_i(v_i) = 0$ with multiplicity 2. The strict transform V_{f-c} of $f - c = 0$ intersects $E(R_i)$ at $(u_i, v_i) = (0, s)$ with multiplicity 2. Let U be a small neighborhood of $(0, s)$ in N such that $U \setminus E(R_i)$ consists of two connected components, say U' and U'' . There are three cases: (1) V_{f-c} intersects both of U' and U'' ; (2) V_{f-c} intersects one of them and does not intersect the other; (3) V_{f-c} does not intersect both of U' and U'' . In case (2), there is a cleaving family and a vanishing family as shown in Figure 5. Thus we have $c \in B_f$.

In case (1), since the multiplicity is 2, V_{f-c} in U consists of either two curves intersecting each other transversely and also intersecting $E(R_i)$ transversely, see on the left in Figure 6, or one curve with multiplicity 2 intersecting $E(R_i)$ transversely. In the former case, $f = c$ is cleaving at infinity from both sides as shown in the figure. In the latter case, $c \in \Sigma_f$. In case (3), $f = c$ has vanishing families from both sides, see on the right in Figure 6. In any case, we have $c \in B_f$.

Conversely, if both of (ii) and (iii) are not satisfied then, applying Proposition 3.1 to $f(x, y) - c$, we can conclude that $c \notin B_f$ unless $c \in \Sigma_f$. $\square$

Remark 3.5. The ‘‘Morse condition’’ on bad faces is crucial especially in case (1) in the above proof. If the multiplicity μ is odd then V_{f-c} can be one curve being tangent to




FIGURE 5. Cleaving and vanishing at infinity on $E(R_i)$ with $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^0(f)$ (Case where V_{f-c} is in one side).




FIGURE 6. Cleaving and vanishing at infinity on $E(R_i)$ with $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^0(f)$ (Case where V_{f-c} is either in both sides or isolated).

$E(R_i)$ with multiplicity μ and intersects both of U' and U'' . In this case, the fibration is trivial in this neighborhood. Hence we cannot generalize the assertion in the case where μ is odd.

If the multiplicity μ is even, $c \notin \Sigma_f$ and it is in case (1) then there are at least two branches of V_{f-c} passing through the intersection point $(0, s)$ and thus a cleaving family exists. Therefore the assertion in Theorem 1.1 holds even if we replace the “Morse condition” on bad faces into the “even multiplicities”.

Example 3.6. Consider the polynomial function $f(x, y) = x(1 + x^m y^{2n})$, where $m, n \geq 1$. From the Newton polygon $\Delta(f)$, there are two covectors orthogonal to the face of $\Delta(f)$, i.e.,

$$Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -2n \\ m \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2n \\ -m \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can easily check that the conditions (i) and (iii) in Theorem 1.1 are not satisfied. If $c \neq 0 = f(0, 0)$ then (ii) is also not satisfied. When $c = 0$, only the covector Q_2

We here explain how the cleaving and vanishing families appear in a real toric variety in the case where $f(x, y) = x(1 + xy^2)$. Set

$$R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_4 = Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R_5 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_6 = Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_7 = R_1.$$

These primitive covectors satisfy the conditions in Section 2 and the associated admissible toric compactification X becomes as shown in Figure 7. We can see from the figure that there are two cleaving families up to equivalence relation defined in Definition 2.7 and there is no vanishing family.




FIGURE 7. A connected component of $f = \varepsilon$ and a connected component of $f = -\varepsilon$, with sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, are described. Both of them are cleaving as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

$$f(x, y) = x + \frac{1}{m}x^m y^m + \frac{2a}{m+1}x^{m+1}y^{m+1} + \frac{1}{m+2}x^{m+2}y^{m+2}$$

with $m \geq 2$. It has no singular point and hence $\Sigma_f = \emptyset$.

From the Newton polygon $\Delta(f)$, the covectors orthogonal to the faces are

$$Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -m-2 \\ m+1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_3 = \begin{pmatrix} m \\ 1-m \end{pmatrix}.$$

Only the face $\Delta(Q_2; f)$ is a bad face. To apply Theorem 1.1, we need to assume that $b_{Q_2}(t) = t^m(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{2a}{m+1}t + \frac{1}{m+2}t^2)$ is a Morse function on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. The critical points are the roots of $\frac{db_{Q_2}}{dt}(t) = t^{m-1}(1 + 2at + t^2) = 0$. Thus b_{Q_2} is Morse on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ if and only if $a \neq \pm 1$. If $-1 < a < 1$ then b_{Q_2} has no critical point on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. If $|a| > 1$ then $t_0 = -a - \sqrt{a^2 - 1}$ and $t_1 = -a + \sqrt{a^2 - 1}$ are the critical points of b_{Q_2} . The face $\Delta(Q_3; f)$ is in $\Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ and $f_{Q_3}(x, y) = x + x^m y^m = 0$ has a solution $(-1, -1)$ in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. Hence $0 \in B_f$. The bifurcation set B_f is now determined for $|a| \neq 1$: $B_f = \{0, b_Q(t_0), b_Q(t_1)\}$ if $|a| > 1$ and $B_f = \{0\}$ if $|a| < 1$.

Now we explain how the cleaving and vanishing families appear in a real toric variety. Set

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_4 = Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -m-2 \\ m+1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ R_5 &= Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_6 = Q_3 = \begin{pmatrix} m \\ 1-m \end{pmatrix}, \\ R_{6+k} &= \begin{pmatrix} m-k \\ 1-m+k \end{pmatrix} \quad (k = 1, \dots, m-3), \quad R_{m+4} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_{m+5} = R_1. \end{aligned}$$

These primitive covectors satisfy the conditions in Section 2 and the associated admissible toric compactification X becomes as shown in Figure 8, which is in the case where $m = 8$ and $|a| > 1$. If $|a| < 1$ then V_f does not intersect $E(R_5)$.




FIGURE 8. A part of a connected component of $f = \varepsilon$ and a part of a connected component of $f = -\varepsilon$, with sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, are described. Both of them are cleaving as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

On the local chart U_5 with coordinates (u_5, v_5) , for each $j = 0, 1$, we have

$$f(u_5, v_5) - f(t_j) = (v_5 - t_j)^2 \hat{g}_j(v_5) + u_5 v_5^8$$

with $\hat{g}_j(t_j) \neq 0$. Thus $V_{f-f(t_j)}$ is tangent to $E(R_5)$ at $(u_5, v_5) = (0, t_j)$ with multiplicity 2. This is in case (2) in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Hence we see that there are a cleaving family and a vanishing family for each $j = 0, 1$. Since a vanishing family does not appear in the settings in Lemma 3.3 and 3.4, we see that there is no other vanishing family. There are two cleaving families with limit $f = 0$ as shown in Figure 8. Here we count the numbers of cleaving and vanishing families up to equivalence relations in Definition 2.7. In summary, this example has four cleaving families and two vanishing families. For other m 's more than 1, we can easily check that f also has the same numbers of cleaving and vanishing families.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2, which determines the number of cleaving and vanishing families counted up to equivalence relations in Definition 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let E^+ and E^0 denote the union of $E(R_i)$'s with $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$ and with $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^0(f)$, and let N^+ and N^0 denote a small, compact neighborhood of E^+ and E^0 in X , respectively. A cleaving family appears either in N^+ or N^0 , see Lemma 3.4 and the proof of Theorem 1.1. A vanishing family appears only in N^0 , see the proof of Theorem 1.1.

First we observe it in N^+ . We may assume $f(0, 0) = 0$ by replacing f by $f(x, y) - f(0, 0)$. Suppose that $E^+ \neq \emptyset$. We may assume that f has the form $f(x, y) = x^\alpha y^\beta F(x, y)$ with either $\alpha > 0$ or $\beta > 0$. We set $E^+ = E_x^+ \cup E_y^+$, where $E_x^+ = \cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ and $E_y^+ = \cup_{i=3}^{k'} E(R_i)$. Here k is the index such that $d(R_{k-1}; f) \leq 0$ and $d(R_k; f) > 0$ (cf. Figure 4) and k' is the index such that $d(R_{k'}; f) > 0$ and $d(R_{k'+1}; f) \leq 0$. Note that if $\alpha = 0$ (resp. $\beta = 0$) then E_x^+ (resp. E_y^+) is empty and that $E_x^+ \cap E_y^+ = \emptyset$. Let R_x^+ (resp. R_y^+) be the sum of $r^+(R_i; f)$'s for $i \geq k$ (resp. $3 \leq i \leq k'$) with $\Delta(R_i; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^+(f)$. Note that $R^+ = R_x^+ + R_y^+$.

We first count the number of cleaving families in a compact neighborhood N_x^+ of E_x^+ . Remark that R_x^+ is equal to the number of intersection points $V_F \cap E_x^+$. A nearby fiber in N_x^+ yields a “cleaving” if and only if both of the endpoints of the fiber in N_x^+ is on the boundary ∂N_x^+ . If an endpoint is not on ∂N_x^+ then it is on $E(R_{k-1})$ if $d(R_{k-1}; f) = 0$ and on the intersection $E(R_{k-1}) \cap E(R_k)$ if $d(R_{k-1}; f) < 0$. Such an endpoint can appear on all of the four quadrants on the chart U_{k-1} corresponding to $\text{Cone}(R_{k-1}, R_k)$. Since V_1 intersects $E(R_m)$ at one point, V_f intersects E_x^+ at $R_x^+ + 1$ points. Adding the 4 endpoints on U_{k-1} , there are totally $4R_x^+ + 8$ endpoints. Hence the curve $\{f = \varepsilon\} \cup \{f = -\varepsilon\}$ has $2R_x^+ + 4$ connected components in N_x^+ . However,

the endpoints lying on $E(R_{k-1})$ do not contribute to “cleavings”. Moreover, there is no connected component both of whose endpoints are on $E(R_{k-1})$. This can be checked as follows: Try to describe a curve in N_x^+ starting at one of the endpoints on $E(R_{k-1})$. Then we meet V_f before coming back near $E(R_{k-1})$. Thus the curve must go out from ∂N_x^+ . There are four connected components which do not contribute to “cleavings”. Hence the number of cleaving families in N_x^+ is $2R_x^+$. This is true even if $E_x^+ = \emptyset$ since there is no cleaving family in this case.

The number of cleaving families in a compact neighborhood N_y^+ of E_y^+ can be counted by the same way and it becomes $2R_y^+$. Since $E_x^+ \cap E_y^+ = \emptyset$, the countings in N_x^+ and N_y^+ do not conflict. Hence the total number of cleaving families in N^+ is $2R_x^+ + 2R_y^+ = 2R^+$.

Next we observe it in N^0 . Since f has only isolated singularities, each critical point of $b_P(t)$ corresponds to an intersection point of V_F and E^0 as shown in Figures 5 and 6. In either case, for each intersection point, the sum of the number of cleaving families and that of vanishing families is 2. Hence the total number of cleaving and vanishing families in N^0 is $2R^0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

5. AN UPPERBOUND OF $|B_f|$

In this section, we do not assume that f is non-degenerate on $\Gamma_\infty^+(f) \cup \Gamma_\infty^-(f)$ and also do not assume that f_P is Morse on a bad face $\Delta(P; f) \in \Gamma_\infty^0(f)$.

We will prove Theorem 1.3 by applying successive admissible toric modifications for each singularity on $\cup_{i=3}^m E(R_i)$ appearing due to degeneracies. We first introduce an admissible toric modification. Though an admissible toric modification is usually defined for a polynomial function or a locally analytic function, we define it for rational functions given as in (2.1). Note that such a modification had been used in [8] for studying singularities at infinity of complex polynomial functions.

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a small neighborhood of the origin and let $\hat{f} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real rational function on U whose expansion is given by $\hat{f}(x, y) = \sum_{(m,n)} a_{m,n} x^m y^n$, where $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m > -M$ for some non-negative integer M and $n \geq 0$. We define the Newton polygon $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(\hat{f})$ of $\hat{f}$ by the convex hull of $\cup_{(m,n)} ((m, n) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2)$, where $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq 0\}$ and the union is taken for all (m, n) such that $a_{m,n} \neq 0$. For a given primitive covector $P = {}^t(p, q)$ with $p, q > 0$, let $d(P; \hat{f})$ denote the minimal value of the linear function $pX + qY$, where $(X, Y) \in \Delta^{\text{loc}}(\hat{f})$. Set $\Delta(P; \hat{f}) := \{(X, Y) \in \Delta^{\text{loc}}(\hat{f}) \mid pX + qY = d(P; \hat{f})\}$, which is called a *face* if $\dim \Delta(P; \hat{f}) = 1$. The partial sum $\hat{f}_P(x, y) = \sum_{(m,n) \in \Delta(P; \hat{f})} a_{m,n} x^m y^n$ is called the *boundary function* for the covector P . If $\Delta(P; \hat{f})$ is a face then it is called the *face function*. A boundary function $\hat{f}_P$ is said to be *degenerate* if $\frac{\partial \hat{f}_P}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial \hat{f}_P}{\partial y} = 0$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^2$. Otherwise it is said to be *non-degenerate*.

Let $\hat{f}$ be a rational function given as above and let $\hat{Q}_i = {}^t(\hat{p}_i, \hat{q}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, \hat{n}$, be primitive covectors such that

- (1) both $\hat{p}_i$ and $\hat{q}_i$ are positive;
- (2) $\Delta(\hat{Q}_i; \hat{f})$ is a compact face;
- (3) the indices are assigned in the counter-clockwise orientation.

Let $\hat{R}_i = {}^t(\hat{r}_i, \hat{s}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, \hat{m}$, be primitive covectors which satisfy the following:

- (1) $\hat{R}_1 = {}^t(1, 0)$ and $\hat{R}_{\hat{m}} = {}^t(0, 1)$;
- (2) both $\hat{r}_i$ and $\hat{s}_i$ are positive for each $\hat{R}_i$, $i = 2, \dots, \hat{m} - 1$;
- (3) $\hat{Q}_i$ is contained in $\{\hat{R}_2, \dots, \hat{R}_{\hat{m}-1}\}$;
- (4) the indices are assigned in the counter-clockwise orientation;
- (5) the determinants of the matrices $(\hat{R}_i, \hat{R}_{i+1})$, $i = 1, \dots, \hat{m} - 1$, are 1.

For each $\text{Cone}(\hat{R}_i, \hat{R}_{i+1})$, $i = 1, \dots, \hat{m} - 1$, an affine coordinate chart (u_i, v_i) is defined by the coordinate transformation

$$x = u_i^{\hat{r}_i} v_i^{\hat{r}_{i+1}}, \quad y = u_i^{\hat{s}_i} v_i^{\hat{s}_{i+1}}.$$

Then a real variety Y is obtained by gluing these coordinate charts, which is described as

$$Y = U \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=2}^{\hat{m}-1} E(\hat{R}_i) \right),$$

where $E(\hat{R}_i)$ is the exceptional divisor corresponding to the covector $\hat{R}_i$. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow U$ be the associated proper mapping, which is called the *admissible toric modification associated with $\{\hat{R}_1, \dots, \hat{R}_{\hat{m}}\}$* . For further information about toric modifications, see [12].

Suppose that $\hat{f}$ has the form

$$\hat{f}(x, y) = x^d (y + c)^{d'} (y^\mu \hat{g}(y) + x \hat{h}(x, y)),$$

where $d, d' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $c \neq 0$, $\hat{g}(y)$ is the expansion of a rational function of one variable y with $\hat{g}(0) \neq 0$, and $\hat{h}(x, y)$ is the expansion of a rational function of two variables (x, y) with $|\hat{h}(0, 0)| < \infty$. Let $\Delta^-(\hat{f})$, $\Delta^0(\hat{f})$ and $\Delta^+(\hat{f})$ denote the union of the compact faces $\Delta(P; \hat{f})$ of $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(\hat{f})$ with $d(P; \hat{f}) < 0$, $d(P; \hat{f}) = 0$ and $d(P; \hat{f}) > 0$, respectively. Set $\ell^-(\hat{f})$ and $\ell^0(\hat{f})$ to be -1 plus the number of lattice points in the segment obtained by projecting $\Delta^-(\hat{f})$ and $\Delta^0(\hat{f})$ to the second axis of $\mathbb{R}^2$ on which $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(\hat{f})$ is described, respectively. Set $\ell^+(\hat{f}) = \mu - \ell^-(\hat{f}) - \ell^0(\hat{f})$.

Definition 5.1. The integers $\ell^+(\hat{f})$, $\ell^0(\hat{f})$ and $\ell^-(\hat{f})$ are called the $(+)$ -, (0) - and $(-)$ -height of $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(\hat{f})$, respectively.

These heights will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Let f be a polynomial function. We first apply an admissible toric compactification $Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$ associated with primitive covectors $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ with respect to $\Delta(f)$. Suppose that f_{R_i} is degenerate for a face $\Delta(R_i; f)$ in $\Gamma_\infty^-(f)$. On U_i , f is given as (2.1). Let $s_1, \dots, s_\eta$ be non-zero real roots of $g_i(v_i) = 0$ and $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\eta$ their multiplicities. For some $\xi \in \{1, \dots, \eta\}$ with $\mu_\xi \geq 2$, which exists since f_{R_i} is degenerate, we apply the change of coordinates

$$(x_1, y_1) = (u_i, v_i - s_\xi).$$

We call (x_1, y_1) *translated coordinates*. The polynomial function f can be extended to Y_1 as a rational function, and is given on the chart (x_1, y_1) as

$$f^1(x_1, y_1) = x_1^{d(R_i; f)} (y_1 + s_\xi)^{d(R_{i+1}; f)} (y_1^{\mu_\xi} g^1(y_1) + x_1 h^1(x_1, y_1)),$$

where $g^1(0) \neq 0$.

Assume that we have applied admissible toric modifications $\pi_i : Y_i \rightarrow Y_{i-1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, \sigma$ successively. Let U^σ be a neighborhood of the origin on the coordinate chart (u_σ, v_σ) in Y_σ obtained after the successive toric modifications and translations of coordinates. We call (u_σ, v_σ) *translated coordinates* also. Let f^σ be the restriction of the pull-back of f to U^σ , which is given as

$$f^\sigma(x_\sigma, y_\sigma) = x_\sigma^{d_\sigma} (y_\sigma + s_\xi^\sigma)^{d'_\sigma} (y_\sigma^{\mu_\sigma} g^\sigma(y_\sigma) + x_\sigma h^\sigma(x_\sigma, y_\sigma)),$$

where $d_\sigma, d'_\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $d_\sigma < 0$, $s_\xi^\sigma \neq 0$, $\mu_\sigma \geq 2$ and $g^\sigma(0) \neq 0$. Applying an admissible toric modification $\pi_{\sigma+1} : Y_{\sigma+1} \rightarrow Y_\sigma$ on U^σ with respect to $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^\sigma)$, we obtain a sequence of admissible toric modifications inductively.

We say that a sequence $Y_\tau \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$ of successive toric modifications is *terminated* if there are no translated coordinates for further toric modifications. Note that a sequence of successive toric modifications is terminated in finite steps. The finiteness is proved in [8, Lemma 4.3] for complex polynomial case and the same proof works for real case also.

Let $Y_\tau \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_\sigma \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a sequence of admissible toric modifications, which is not necessary to be terminated. Let $\{R_1^\sigma, \dots, R_{m_\sigma}^\sigma\}$ be the primitive covectors for the toric modification $\pi_{\sigma+1} : Y_{\sigma+1} \rightarrow Y_\sigma$ with respect to $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^\sigma)$, containing primitive covectors $\{Q_1^\sigma, \dots, Q_{n_\sigma}^\sigma\}$ orthogonal to the compact faces of $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^\sigma)$. For each $j = 2, \dots, m_\sigma - 1$, on the local chart U_j^σ in $Y_{\sigma+1}$ corresponding to $\text{Cone}(R_j^\sigma, R_{j+1}^\sigma)$, the pull-back f_j^σ of f is given as

$$f_j^\sigma(u_{\sigma,j}, v_{\sigma,j}) = u_{\sigma,j}^{d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)} v_{\sigma,j}^{d(Q_{j+1}^\sigma; f^\sigma)} (g_j^\sigma(v_{\sigma,j}) + u_{\sigma,j} h_j^\sigma(u_{\sigma,j}, v_{\sigma,j})).$$

Now we define an integer $\lambda(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)$ by

$$\lambda(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) = \begin{cases} 0 & d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) > 0 \\ r^0(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) & d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) = 0 \\ \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{\sigma,j}} (\mu_\xi - 1) & d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $r^0(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)$ is the number of non-zero real roots of $\frac{\partial b_{Q_j^\sigma}}{\partial t}(t) = 0$, $\Xi_{\sigma,j}$ is the set of indices of non-zero real multiple roots of $g_j^\sigma(v_{\sigma,j}) = 0$ at which we did not apply further successive toric modifications in $Y_\tau \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$, and μ_ξ is the multiplicity of the root with index $\xi \in \Xi_{\sigma,j}$. Set $\epsilon_\sigma = 1$ if the (+)-height of $\Delta(f_j^\sigma)$ is more than or equal to 2, and set $\epsilon_\sigma = 0$ otherwise.

Similarly, for the primitive covectors $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_n\}$ orthogonal to the faces of $\Delta(f)$, we define

$$\lambda(Q_i; f) = \begin{cases} 0 & d(Q_i; f) > 0 \\ r^0(Q_i; f) & d(Q_i; f) = 0 \\ \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_i} (\mu_\xi - 1) & d(Q_i; f) < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $r^0(Q_i; f)$ is the number of non-zero real roots of $\frac{\partial b_{Q_i}}{\partial t}(t) = 0$, Ξ_i is the set of indices of real multiple roots of $g_i(v_i) = 0$ in (2.1) at which we did not apply further successive toric modifications, and μ_ξ is the multiplicity of the root with index $\xi \in \Xi_i$. Set $\epsilon = 0$ if $R^+ = 0$ and $\epsilon = 1$ if $R^+ > 0$ as in Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $Y_\tau \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a sequence of successive toric modifications which is terminated. Then*

$$|B_f| \leq |\Sigma_f| + \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(Q_i; f) + \sum_{\sigma} \left(\epsilon_\sigma + \sum_{j=1}^{n_\sigma} \lambda(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) \right),$$

where σ runs over all indices of translated coordinates appearing in the successive toric modifications.

Proof. Since the sequence of successive toric modifications is terminated, $\Xi_{\sigma,j} = \emptyset$ for any (σ, j) .

We first check the contribution of the faces $\Delta(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)$ with $d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) > 0$ to $|B_f|$. Consider the variety $Y_{\sigma+1}$ obtained by an admissible toric modification $\pi_{\sigma+1} : Y_{\sigma+1} \rightarrow Y_\sigma$ with respect to $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^\sigma)$. Let $\ell^+(f^\sigma)$ be the (+)-height of $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^\sigma)$. Suppose that $\ell^+(f^\sigma) \geq 2$. If there are cleaving families near $E(Q_j^\sigma)$ with $d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) > 0$ then their limits correspond to the same value in B_f . Hence its contribution is at most 1. If $\ell^+(f^\sigma) = 0$ then there is no contribution. If $\ell^+(f^\sigma) = 1$ and there is no face $\Delta(P; f^\sigma)$ with $d(P; f^\sigma) > 0$ then there is no contribution also. Suppose that $\ell^+(f^\sigma) = 1$ and there is such a face, say $\Delta(Q_{j_0}^\sigma; f^\sigma)$. Then, as shown in Figure 9, we see that the fibration of nearby fibers passing near $E(Q_{j_0}^\sigma)$ is trivial. Hence the contribution of

the face $\Delta(Q_{j_0}^\sigma; f^\sigma)$ is 0. There is no vanishing family in a neighborhood of $E(Q_j^\sigma)$ with $d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) > 0$ in $Y_{\sigma+1}$. Thus the contribution of the faces $\Delta(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)$ with $d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) > 0$ is at most ϵ_σ .




FIGURE 9. The triviality of the fibration in the case $\ell^+(f^\sigma) = 1$.

Next we check the contribution of the faces $\Delta(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)$ with $d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) = 0$. The number of values appearing as their limits is at most the number of non-zero real roots of $\frac{db_{Q_j^\sigma}}{dt}(t) = 0$. Hence the contribution is at most $r^0(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma)$.

The same observation can be applied to neighborhoods of the divisors $E(Q_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and we have the upper bound $\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(Q_i; f)$ of the contribution. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 5.3. The phenomenon having the triviality of the fibration in the case $\ell^+ = 1$, shown in Figure 9, appears in complex polynomial case also. A face $\Delta(P; f^\sigma)$ with $d(P; f^\sigma) > 0$ in the case $\ell^+ = 1$ is called a *stable boundary face* in [8, Definition 5.5]. The exception of such a face is pointed out, for instance, in [1, Example 2.9 (3)] also.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $Y_\tau \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a sequence of successive toric modifications which is not terminated. Set

$$\Lambda_\tau = \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(Q_i; f) + \sum_{\sigma=1}^{\tau} \left(\epsilon_\sigma + \sum_{j=1}^{n_\sigma} \lambda(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) \right).$$

We first prove that this sum does not increase after an admissible toric modification $\pi_{\tau+1} : Y_{\tau+1} \rightarrow Y_\tau$, i.e., prove the inequality $\Lambda_{\tau+1} \leq \Lambda_\tau$.

Apply a toric modification $\pi_{\tau+1}$ at the origin of translated coordinates (x_τ, y_τ) . The pull-back $f^{\tau+1} = \pi_{\tau+1}^* f^\tau$ of f has the form

$$f^{\tau+1}(x_{\tau+1}, y_{\tau+1}) = x_{\tau+1}^{d_{\tau+1}} (y_{\tau+1} + s_\xi)^{d'_{\tau+1}} (y_{\tau+1}^{\mu_\xi} g^{\tau+1}(y_{\tau+1}) + x_{\tau+1} h^{\tau+1}(x_{\tau+1}, y_{\tau+1})),$$

where $d_{\tau+1}, d'_{\tau+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $d_{\tau+1} < 0$, $s_\xi \neq 0$, $\mu_\xi \geq 2$ and $g^{\tau+1}(0) \neq 0$. Let ℓ^+ , ℓ^0 and ℓ^- denote the $(+)$ -, (0) - and $(-)$ -heights of $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^{\tau+1})$, respectively. Note that $\ell^+ + \ell^0 + \ell^- \leq \mu_\xi$.

We will prove that the total contribution of the faces $\Delta(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1})$ to $\Lambda_{\tau+1}$ is at most $\ell := \ell^+ + \ell^0 + \ell^- - 1$. From $\Delta^{\text{loc}}(f^{\tau+1})$, we see that the contribution $\sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{\tau+1,j}} (\mu_\xi - 1)$ in (5.1) in the case $d(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1}) < 0$ is at most $\ell^- - 1$. The contribution in the case $d(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1}) = 0$ is at most ℓ^0 and the contribution in the case $d(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1}) > 0$ is $\epsilon_{\tau+1}$. Hence if $\ell^- > 0$ then the total contribution is at most ℓ . Suppose that $\ell^- = 0$. If $\ell^+ = 0$ then the face $\Delta(P; f^{\tau+1})$ with $d(P; f^{\tau+1}) = 0$ contains the origin $(0, 0)$ and the contribution in the case $d(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1}) = 0$ becomes at most $\ell^0 - 1$. Hence the total contribution is at most ℓ . If $\ell^+ \geq 2$ then the contribution in the case $d(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1}) > 0$ becomes at most $\ell^+ - 1$, and hence the total contribution is also at most ℓ . If $\ell^+ = 1$ then $\epsilon_{\tau+1} = 0$, i.e., the contribution in the case $d(Q_j^{\tau+1}; f^{\tau+1}) > 0$ is 0. Hence the total contribution is at most ℓ . Since $\ell := \ell^+ + \ell^0 + \ell^- - 1 \leq \mu_\xi - 1$, we have

$$\Lambda_{\tau+1} \leq \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(Q_i; f) + \sum_{\sigma=1}^{\tau} \left(\epsilon_\sigma + \sum_{j=1}^{n_\sigma} \lambda(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) \right) - (\mu_\xi - 1) + \ell \leq \Lambda_\tau.$$

Thus Λ_τ does not increase. By the same argument, we have $\Lambda_1 \leq \Lambda_0 := \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(Q_i; f)$.

Suppose that a sequence of successive toric modifications is terminated at $\tau = \tau_0$. By Proposition 5.2 we have $|B_f| \leq |\Sigma_f| + \Lambda_{\tau_0}$. We then apply the inequality $\Lambda_{\tau+1} \leq \Lambda_\tau$ inductively:

$$\begin{aligned} |B_f| &\leq |\Sigma_f| + \Lambda_{\tau_0} \leq |\Sigma_f| + \Lambda_{\tau_0-1} \leq \cdots \leq |\Sigma_f| + \Lambda_1 \\ &\leq |\Sigma_f| + \Lambda_0 = |\Sigma_f| + \epsilon + R^0 + \sum_{\Delta(P;f) \in \Gamma_\infty^-(f)} \mu(P; f). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 5.4. Let $Y_\tau \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Y_1 \supset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a sequence of successive toric modifications which is terminated. Then a vanishing family appears only in a neighborhood of a divisor $E(Q_j^\sigma)$ with $d(Q_j^\sigma; f^\sigma) = 0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Artal Bartolo, I. Luengo, A. Melle-Hernández, *High school algebra of the theory of dicritical divisors: Atypical fibers for special pencils and polynomials* J. Algebra Appl. **14** (2015), no. 9, 1540009, 26 pp.
- [2] A. Bodin, A. Pichon, *Meromorphic functions, bifurcation sets and fibred links*, Math. Res. Lett. **14** (2007), no. 3, 413–422.
- [3] M. Coste, M.J. de la Puente, *Atypical values at infinity of a polynomial function on the real plane: an erratum, and an algorithmic criterion*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **162** (2001), no. 1, 23–35.
- [4] L.G. Dias, M. Tibăr, *Detecting bifurcation values at infinity of real polynomials*, Math. Z. **279** (2015), no. 1-2, 311–319.

- [5] H.V. Hà and D.T. Lê, *Sur la topologie des polynômes complexes*, Acta Math. Vietnam. **9**, (1984) 21–32.
- [6] H.V. Hà and L.A. Nguyễn, *Le comportement géométrique à l’infini des polynômes de deux variables complexes*, C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Série I, **309**, No. 3, (1989) 183–186.
- [7] H.V. Hà and T.T. Nguyễn, *Atypical values at infinity of polynomial and rational functions on an algebraic surface in $\mathbb{R}^n$* , Acta Math. Vietnamica **36** (2011) no. 2, 537–553.
- [8] M. Ishikawa, *The bifurcation set of a complex polynomial function of two variables and the Newton polygons of singularities at infinity*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **54** (2002), no. 1, 161–196.
- [9] A. G. Kouchnirenko, *Polyhedres de Newton et nombre de Milnor*, Invent. Math. **32** (1976), 1–31.
- [10] V.T. Le, M. Oka, *Estimation of the number of the critical values at infinity of a polynomial function $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$* , Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **31** (1995), no. 4, 577–598.
- [11] A. Nemethi, A. Zaharia, *Milnor fibration at infinity*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **3** (1992), no. 3, 323–335.
- [12] M. Oka, *Non-degenerate Complete Intersection Singularity*, Actualités Math., Hermann, 1998.
- [13] T.S. Pham, *On the topology of the Newton boundary at infinity*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **60** (2008), no. 4, 1065–1081.
- [14] T.T. Nguyen, *Bifurcation set, M-tameness, asymptotic critical values and Newton polyhedrons*, Kodai Math. J. **36** (2013), no. 1, 77–90.
- [15] M. Suzuki, *Propriétés topologiques des polynômes de deux variables complexes, et automorphismes algébriques de l’espace $\mathbb{C}^2$* , J. Math. Soc. Japan, **26**, (1974) 241–257.
- [16] M. Tibăr, A. Zaharia, *Asymptotic behaviour of families of real curves*, Manuscripta Math. **99** (1999), 383–393.
- [17] A. Zaharia, *On the bifurcation set of a polynomial function and Newton boundary, II*, Kodai Math. J. **19** (1996), 218–223.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, SENDAI, 980-8578, JAPAN

E-mail address: ishikawa@m.tohoku.ac.jp

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, VIETNAM ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 18 HOANG QUOC VIET ROAD, CAU GIAY DISTRICT, 10307 HANOI, VIETNAM

E-mail address: ntthang@math.ac.vn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF DALAT, 1 PHU DONG THIEN VUONG, DALAT, VIETNAM

E-mail address: sonpt@dlu.edu.vn